

OPINION 127

SUSPENSION OF RULES FOR *Lepidocyclina* GÜMBEL, 1868, TYPE
Nummulites mantelli

SUMMARY.—Complying with expert advice from specialists in the group involved, the Commission herewith Suspends the Rules and places *Lepidocyclina* Gümbel, 1868, type *Nummulites mantelli*, in the Official List of Generic Names, with *Cyclosiphon* Ehrenberg, 1856, type *Nummulites mantelli*, as objective synonym. The consultants agree, almost unanimously, that to apply the Rules in this case would produce greater confusion than uniformity.

STATEMENT OF CASE.—Commissioner Chapman of Melbourne, Australia, recommends that the Rules be suspended in the case of *Lepidocyclina*, 1868, vs. *Cyclosiphon*, 1856.

DISCUSSION.—According to the evidence verified by the Secretary the nomenclatorial premises in the case of *Cyclosiphon*, 1856, versus *Lepidocyclina*, 1868, are very clear.

Cyclosiphon Ehrenberg, 1856, Ueber den Grünsand, K. Akad. Wiss., Berlin Abhandl., für 1855, p. 145, is monotypic, being based solely upon *Nummulites mantelli*.

Lepidocyclina Gümbel, 1868, Beiträge zur Foraminiferenfauna der nordalpinen Eocängebilde, K. bay. Akad. Wiss., m.-p., Cl. Bd. 10, no. 2, pp. 689 and 717, was originally published as a subgenus of *Orbitoides* and contained three species, i. e., *L. mantelli* Morton, *L. dilatata* Michelotti, and *L. burdigalensis* Gümbel. No type species was designated, indicated or intimated, directly or indirectly.

Douvillé, 1898, Bull. Soc. Géol. France, ser. 3, vol. 26, p. 594, definitely designated *Nummulites mantelli* as genotype, as correctly stated by Galloway, 1928, Journ. Paleontol., vol. 2, p. 65, and as accepted by Vaughan, 1929, p. 29.

As both generic names are based upon the same type species they are objective synonyms regardless of any subjective interpretation in respect to their structure (we name objects, not our conception of those objects). On this account Galloway, 1928, pp. 46-64, logically accepted *Cyclosiphon* in preference to *Lepidocyclina*.

The Commission is now requested to suspend the rules and to validate *Lepidocyclina* in place of *Cyclosiphon*.

On account of the general adoption of *Lepidocyclina* and its importance in paleontology the Secretary has referred this case to various

specialists for expression of opinion, and in reply has received the following:

J. A. Cushman reports:

I have little to add to the debate on these two names [*Lepidocyclina* and *Cyclosiphon*]. I should try to be consistent and use *Cyclosiphon*, but as noted in Vaughan's paper here appended, it is a very great doubt as to what was meant by Ehrenberg, and his types are certainly not at all helpful. On account of the very great uncertainty, I would advocate the retention of the name *Lepidocyclina* in this case.

When in Berlin in 1927 I examined the material of *Cyclosiphon* in the Ehrenberg collection there and found it to consist of various things, mostly glauconitic casts, a considerable portion of which did not even belong to the family Orbitoididae. Of the material which could be referred to an orbitoid none was of sufficient completeness even to be specifically identifiable.

Evidently Ehrenberg from his description of *Cyclosiphon* had not seen the *Nummulites mantelli* which he referred to as his generic description would exclude that species from the genus *Cyclosiphon*.

It seems to me very clear from the evidence that no good purpose would result from trying to revive the name *Cyclosiphon* with all the attendant confusion that would necessarily arise. I, therefore, urge most strongly the retention of the name *Lepidocyclina* with *Nummulites mantelli* as the type species of both the genus and the typical subgenus.

T. W. Vaughan, "A Note on the Names *Cyclosiphon* Ehrenberg, 1856, and *Lepidocyclina* Gümbel, 1868", Journ. Paleontol., vol. 3, no. 1, March 1929, pp. 28-29, reviews the case of *Lepidocyclina* and concludes that:

Because of confusion surrounding *Cyclosiphon*, it appears to me undesirable, even unfortunate, to revive that name, and it seems that the use of the name *Lepidocyclina*, with *Nummulites mantelli* as the type-species of both the genus and the typical subgenus, should be continued.

Letter from Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.:

The proposition for suspension of the Rules in zoological nomenclature for the purpose of retaining the two generic names *Lepidocyclina* and *Nummulites* has been considered by all of the Geological Survey paleontologists now in Washington whose work involves the use of zoological names. While the workers of this group subscribe to the rule of priority for general use they are unanimous in their recommendation that the rule should be suspended in its application to the two names above mentioned so that they may be continued in use.

The signed statements of the several paleontologists are attached.

Letters from Survey paleontologists:

In the case of a generic name which has been in long and general usage there seems nothing to be lost and much to be gained by retaining it, even though some one may discover that an older, practically unknown name has priority over it.

I therefore recommend that *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina* be given validity by the International Commission. I feel, however, that exceptions should be made only in extreme cases such as the ones here presented.

Signed: L. W. Stephenson.

"I concur in the above statement." T. W. Stanton.

"Concur." Edwin Kirk, C. Wythe Cooke, W. C. Mansfield, Chas. Butts.

"Agreed, both as to making exceptions only in extreme cases and as applied here to *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*." George H. Girty.

I believe that the substitution of *Camerina*, almost entirely unused and unknown, for *Nummulites*, extensively used for over a century, is a useless bit of hair-splitting legal procedure. It will lead to more confusion than clarity. Much the same is true with respect to *Cyclosiphon* and *Lepidocyclina*. I can see no profit whatever in going back into the literature of the dim past to dig up names that have only the legal show of validity and using them to replace widely used and well understood terms [irrelevant personal opinion-C. W. S.]. Let us keep *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*.

Signed: John B. Reeside, Jr., Jan. 25, 1920.

"I agree with the above statement." P. V. Roundy, Feb. 5, 1920.

"Amen and again Amen." Chas. Butts.

In cases in which the confusion arising from the resurrection of an older name is obviously to the disadvantage of the science [relevant testimony-C. W. S.], especially as in the cases under consideration in which no good save the restoration of questionably earned rights to Ehrenberg and Bruguière appear to offset the ill it would do the science, I am opposed to replacing a well known and generally used name by an older one that never attained common usage. Therefore I am in favor of retaining *Lepidocyclina* and *Nummulites*.

Signed: E. O. Ulrich, Jan. 20, 1920.

Letter from Edward Willard Berry, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, U. S. A.:

I understand that there is pending before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the decision whether to retain the generic use of *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*. I wish to go on record as being in favor of retaining these two genera in the Classification.

The following are expressions of opinion from Australian specialists:

Prof. Walter Howchin, F. G. S.:

I am heartily in accord with you for the retention of the generic names *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*. These names have become so thoroughly incorporated in the literature of the Foraminifera that their substitution would involve serious inconvenience and confusion, priority notwithstanding. I hope that the exceptions you suggest will be agreed to.

W. J. Parr, F. R. M. S.:

I think that the genera *Nummulites* Lamarck and *Lepidocyclina* Gumbel should be retained as *nomina conservanda* in place of the earlier *Camerina* Bruguière and *Cyclosiphon* Ehrenberg.

I am generally opposed to the Suspension of the Rules, but unlike the other foraminifera genera which have been superseded recently, *Lepidocyclina* and *Nummulites* have been much used in general geological literature and a change to the older genera would certainly lead to much confusion which it is desirable to avoid.

Robert A. Keble, F. G. S. Paleontologist :

I am in thorough agreement with the retention of *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*. By doing so the literature becomes intelligible at a glance and unconfused by the rules of nomenclature. Expressed in terms of time saved, such [word omitted] has a true economic value; confusion and uncertainty must obviously accompany a reversion to the strict order of priority.

There remains, then, the question of sentiment. Bruguière and Ehrenberg, the aggrieved authorities, have long passed away, but there is no question of depriving them of their priority. These unselfish pioneers would not have condoned for a moment the waste of time and confusion that would ensue in establishing their presumed right of priority.

Miss Irene Crespin, Paleontologist :

As far as the two genera, *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina*, are concerned, I would emphatically support the retention of these names by a suspension of the Rules.

A. C. Collins, student of the Victorian Tertiary Foraminifera :

I should like to express my personal opinion that the generic names *Lepidocyclina* Gumbel and *Nummulites* Lamarck should be retained in preference to earlier names. As these names are so widely used in stratigraphic references, their alteration would, I think, create confusion amongst nonspecialists in the group, and I see no useful purpose to be served [in these cases] by the rigid application of the rules of nomenclature.

Frederick A. Singleton, M. Sc. :

My formal opinion concerning *Nummulites* and *Lepidocyclina* is that both should be placed on the official list of *nomina conservanda*, and it is impossible to reject one and not the other, *Cyclosiphon* having stronger claims than *Camerina*.

The case was submitted to the Commission for informal ballot. The resulting vote stood six (6) for Suspension, four (4) for enforcement of the Rules.

With his informal [affirmative] vote Commissioner Bather transmits the note :

Professor A. Morley Davies, Mr. Heron-Allen, Dr. H. Dighton Thomas, and Mr. A. Wrigley advocate the suspension of the Rules in favor of *Lepidocyclina*. Mr. C. P. Chatwin, on the contrary side, writes: "The question is: do we know what Ehrenberg meant by '= *Nummulites mantelli*'? In my opinion we do." In my opinion, from the evidence of Vaughan and Cushman, we do not. That is just the point in dispute. I may remark that C. D. Sberborn, 1893, "Index

to Foraminifera", quotes "*Cyclosiphon?* Ehrenberg., Abhandl. K. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1855, p. 168", and adds "*Orbitoides* fragment, referred elsewhere by Ehrenberg to *O. mantelli*." Obviously this high authority on foraminifera, bibliography, and nomenclature hesitated to accept *Cyclosiphon*.

From a strictly nomenclatural standpoint I agree with the Secretary that this uncertainty has no bearing on the incidence of the Rules; but this only shows how ridiculous adherence to the letter of the law may sometimes be.

It is not clear to me what confusion would be caused by substituting *Cyclosiphon* for *Lepidocyclina*, but I gather that the latter name has long been in general use, whereas no one seems to have used *Cyclosiphon* between Ehrenberg (1856) and Galloway (1928). It is not in the Nomenclators of Bronn, Scudder, or Waterhouse.

With his informal [negative] vote Commissioner Stone sends the statement:

The privilege of asking for a Suspension of the Rules is in danger of being abused. I should advocate it *only* in cases (1) that are so involved that various interpretations are possible or (2) that seriously affect fields and activities outside of pure zoological nomenclature. With too much leniency our whole system will become utterly inconsistent.

The Secretary has corresponded with the following persons, also, who are interested in this case and who approve of a Suspension of the Rules. Most of these workers have read the Summary of this Opinion and have subscribed to it:

R. Wright Barker, Tampico, Mexico; W. S. Cole, Columbus, O.; J. A. Cushman, Sharon, Mass.; A. M. Davies, London; S. Hanzawa, Sendai, Japan; L. G. Heubest, Washington, D. C.; H. K. Hodson, Caripito, Mexico; W. L. F. Nuttall, Cambridge, England; D. K. Palmer, Matanzas, Cuba; H. J. Plummer, Austin, Tex.; G. M. Ponton, Tallahassee, Fla.; L. Ritter, Utrecht, Holland; A. Silvestri, Milan, Italy; G. Stefanini, Pisa, Italy; J. H. F. Umbgrove, Delft, Holland; I. M. van der Vlerk, Leiden, Holland; G. L. Whipple, Puerto Mexico, Mexico; H. Yabe, Sendai, Japan.

The Secretary invites attention to the facts: (1) that the specialists consulted are agreed upon the advisability of Suspension in this case; (2) the case involves geological record, i. e., a coordinate branch of science, and zoologists should be doubly conservative in arriving at conclusions on cases of this type which may have important economic bearings and which have become thoroughly established in paleontological and geological literature.

In view of the foregoing data the Secretary recommends that the Summary given above be adopted as the Opinion of the Commission.

Opinion prepared by Stiles.

Opinion concurred in by thirteen (13) Commissioners: Apstein, Cabrera, Chapman, Fautham, Horvath, Ishikawa, Jordan, Pellegrin, Silvestri, Stejneger, Stiles, Stone, Peters.

Opinion dissented from by no Commissioner.

Not voting: Bolivar, Handlirsch, Richter.

Note: In the case of *Nummulites* eight (8) Commissioners (Apstein, Bather, Chapman, Horvath, Ishikawa, Pellegrin, Silvestri, and Stiles) voted for suspension; four (4) Commissioners (Cabrera, Jordan, Stephenson, and Stone) voted against suspension; not voting, five (5) Commissioners (Bolivar, Handlirsch, Richter, Stejneger, and Warren). Accordingly this case is tabled until the next meeting of the Commission.